

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION**

ANTHONY ROBINSON

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 2: 24-cv-02947-MSN-tmp

EEOC, EDMOND C. SIMS,
CANDICE WILLIAMS, KAREN
JOHNSON, and THOMAS
MCDANIEL,

Defendants.

**ORDER OVERRULING OBJECTIONS AND ADOPTING REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION**

Before the Court is the Chief Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 8, "Report"), entered December 18, 2024. The Report recommends dismissing Plaintiff Anthony Robinson's Complaint (ECF No. 2) for failure to state a claim pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). On January 16, 2025, Plaintiff filed Objections (ECF No. 11) to the Report.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Congress enacted 28 U.S.C. § 636 to relieve the burden on the federal judiciary by permitting the assignment of district court duties to magistrate judges. *See United States v. Curtis*, 237 F.3d 598, 602 (6th Cir. 2001) (citing *Gomez v. United States*, 490 U.S. 858, 869–70 (1989)); *see also Baker v. Peterson*, 67 F. App'x 308, 310 (6th Cir. 2003). For dispositive matters, "[t]he district judge must determine *de novo* any part of the magistrate judge's disposition that has been properly objected to." *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3); 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1). After reviewing the evidence, the court is free to accept, reject, or modify the magistrate judge's proposed findings or

recommendations. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The district court is not required to review—under a *de novo* or any other standard—those aspects of the report and recommendation to which no objection is made. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). The district court should adopt the magistrate judge’s findings and rulings to which no specific objection is filed. *See id.* at 151.

Objections to any part of a magistrate judge’s disposition “must be clear enough to enable the district court to discern those issues that are dispositive and contentious.” *Miller v. Currie*, 50 F.3d 373, 380 (6th Cir. 1995); *see also Arn*, 474 U.S. at 147 (stating that the purpose of the rule is to “focus attention on those issues . . . that are at the heart of the parties’ dispute.”). Each objection to the magistrate judge’s recommendation should include how the analysis is wrong, why it was wrong, and how *de novo* review will obtain a different result on that particular issue. *See Howard v. Sec’y of Health & Human Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505, 509 (6th Cir. 1991). A general objection, or one that merely restates the arguments previously presented and addressed by the magistrate judge, does not sufficiently identify alleged errors in the report and recommendation. *Id.* When an objection reiterates the arguments presented to the magistrate judge, the report and recommendation should be reviewed for clear error. *Verdone v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, No. 16-CV-14178, 2018 WL 1516918, at *2 (E.D. Mich. Mar. 28, 2018) (citing *Ramirez v. United States*, 898 F. Supp. 2d 659, 663 (S.D.N.Y. 2012)); *Equal Employment Opportunity Comm’n v. Dolgencorp, LLC*, 277 F. Supp. 3d 932, 965 (E.D. Tenn. 2017).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Plaintiff’s Objections span 427 pages (ECF No. 11 at Page ID 123–549) and reiterate prior arguments. The Objections include extensive exhibits such as journal entries, emails, letters, court filings, press releases, and news articles. Among the materials are letters cut from magazines to

form words (ECF No. 11-5 at PageID 312–319), and in one correspondence, Plaintiff referred to himself as “YOUR WORSE NIGHTMARE.” (ECF No. 11-7 at Page ID 469.)

Rather than identifying specific errors in the Chief Magistrate Judge’s Report, Plaintiff’s Objections restate his belief that the EEOC and its employees improperly handled those claims. As the Chief Magistrate Judge correctly noted, the EEOC and its employees are not subject to suit for their handling of discrimination complaints. *See Milhous v. EEOC*, No. 97-5242, 1998 U.S. App. LEXIS 6042, at *3 (6th Cir. Mar. 24, 1998); *Jackson v. Frank*, No. 90-1266, 1990 U.S. App. LEXIS 20669, at *3 (6th Cir. Nov. 23, 1990).

For the reasons stated above, Plaintiff’s Objections (ECF No. 11) are **OVERRULED**. The Court **ADOPTS** the Chief Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 8) in its entirety. Accordingly, Plaintiff’s Complaint (ECF No. 2) is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

IT IS SO ORDERED, this 24th day of March, 2025.

s/ Mark S. Norris

MARK S. NORRIS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE